

Translation of the pertinent portions of the International Search Report and the Written Notification, mailed 06/24/2004

This International Search Report comprises a total of five pages. Copies of the cited references are enclosed.

4. Regarding the title of the invention
the wording filed by Applicant is approved.
5. Regarding the abstract
the wording has been determined by the Office in accordance with Rule 38.2b) in the version shown in Field IV [and as it appears on the cover page of the published PCT application]
6. Fig. 24 is to be published with the abstract, since Applicant has not suggested a drawing figure.

Written Notification

1. This notification contains information regarding the following items:

- I Basis of the Report
- II Priority
- V Reasoned Determination under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i)

2. If, as indicated above, this Notification is considered to be a written notification from IPEA, Applicant is requested to file written comments and, if applicable, amendments with IPEA prior to the end of three months starting with the day, on which Form PCT/ISA/220 was mailed, or prior to the end of 22 months starting at the priority date, depending on which term ends last.

Field I - Basis of the Report

[there are no entries in this section]

Field II - Priority

No copy of the priority document has been filed yet.

Field V - Reasoned Determination under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i)

1. Determination

Novelty	Yes: Claims 4 to 75
	No: Claims 1 to 3
Inventive Activities	Yes: Claims
	No: Claims 1 to 75
Commercial Applicability	Yes: Claims 1 to 75
	No: Claims

2. Documents and Explanations:

see the attached sheet

SHEET ATTACHED TO THE WRITTEN NOTIFICATION

Field No. I

The following application documents were made the basis of the examination in the version in connection with the Treaty Countries [list of the countries]:

Specification, pages

1 to 65 in the original version

Claims. Nos.

1 to 75 in the original version

Drawings, sheets:

1/25 to 25/25 in the original version

Field No. V

1. Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: EP-A-0 638 419

D2: Finkbeiner, G. "Investment Decisions in Connection with Newspaper Publishing Should Always be Based on the Planned Workload" in Deutscher Drucker, Deutscher Drucker, publs., vol. 29, No. 36, September 30, 1993, pages W35 to 37.

Independent Claims:

2. The instant application does not meet the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject of claim 3 is not novel within the meaning of Article 33(2) PCT:

Document D1 discloses (references in parentheses relate to this document):

- a printing press with two satellite printing units (5), wherein initially two further printing groups (5) are assigned to the two satellite printing units (5) on a level above the print locations of the satellite printing units (5), by means of which two webs, which had been imprinted on one side in the two satellite printing units (5) can be imprinted in one color on the other side.

3. The instant application does not meet the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject of claims 1, 19 is not based on inventive activities within the meaning of Article 33(3) PCT.

3.1 Document D1 is considered to be the closest prior art in respect to the subject of claim 1. It discloses (references in parentheses relate to this document):

- a printing press (page 2, lines 19 and 20) with at least one first printing tower (1) having two stacked printing units (5).

Therefore the subject of claim 1 differs from this known printing press in that a further printing group is arranged on a level above the print locations of the upper (second) printing unit.

Thus, the object to be attained by means of the instant invention can be seen to lie in making possible a simple, cost-efficient, space-saving and base-saving construction, simultaneously along with a large variability of the product, or intermediate product.

The attainment proposed in claim 1 of the instant application cannot be considered to be inventive for the following reasons (Article 33(3) PCT):

An obvious solution would be to construct an additional printing module for improving the variability of the intermediate product.

Document D1 clearly shows that it is possible to arrange at least two printing units, for example three printing units, one above the other.

The third stacked printing unit (5) is a further printing group, so that the subject of claim 1 is made obvious.

3.2 Document D1 [?] is considered to be the closest prior art in respect to the subject of claim 19. It discloses (references in parentheses relate to this document):

- a printing press with several printing towers (1), each having respectively two satellite printing units (5).

The subject of claim 19 therefore differs from this known document D1 in that the printing press additionally has two three-cylinder printing groups or one six-cylinder printing unit.

Thus the object to be attained by means of the instant invention can be seen to lie in achieving maximum color and page flexibility with the lowest possible number of inking groups.

The solution proposed by claim 19 of the instant application cannot be considered to be inventive for the following reasons (Article 33(3) PCT):

Document D2 discloses a nine-cylinder unit in connection with a three-cylinder color deck (page 2, column 3) for 4/1 and 1/4 printing. Furthermore, D2 discloses a ten-cylinder satellite in connection with a three- or six-cylinder color deck.

Regarding the characteristic "two three-cylinder printing groups or a six-cylinder printing unit", Document D2 describes the same advantages (color and page flexibility) as the instant application and attains the object of the invention (page 3, column 1). Therefore one skilled in the art would consider the incorporation of this characteristic into the printing press described in D1 as a customary step for attaining the stated object.

4. The same reasoning correspondingly applies to independent claims 28, 58, 62, 65.

4.1 In view of documents D1 and D2, one skilled in the art would consider it to be a customary way of proceeding to use a printing press with stacked printing units and two three-cylinder printing groups or one six-cylinder printing unit for a **printing process** (see claim 28) for four webs, so that, following imprinting, the two webs, which were imprinted multi-colored on one side and in a single color on the other side would come to rest between the two webs which were imprinted in several colors on both sides.

4.2 In view of documents D1 and D2, one skilled in the art would consider it to be a customary way of proceeding to combine the printing towers (Figs. 6 to 9) with each other in order to create the claimed **print product** (see claim 58).

Several (different) stacked printing units, a different number of webs, and several (different) parameters, for example number of cylinders per printing unit, web guidance, etc., are known from the prior art. It cannot be considered to constitute inventive output to select from several options, if this lies within the scope of what one skilled in the art is accustomed to doing because of considerations with which he is familiar or by routine testing (see the Guidelines, C, IV-attachment, 3.1.ii)).

4.3 For the same reasons the subject of product claims 62, 65 is not based on inventive activities, and therefore does not meet the criteria mentioned in Article 33(3) PCT.

Dependent Claims:

4.4 In view of the disclosures of documents D1 and D2 in combination with each other, dependent claims 4 to 18, 20 to 27, 29 to 57, 59 to 61, 63, 64, 66 to 75 do not contain any characteristics which, in combination with the characteristics of any claim from which they depend, would meet the requirements of PCT regarding novelty or inventive activities.

Clarity:

5. Although claims 1, 3, 19, or 58, 62, 65 were written as separate independent claims, they actually appear to relate only to a printing press or only to a printed product, and obviously differ from each other only by different definitions of the subject for which protection is being sought, or by terminology used for the characteristics of this subject. Therefore the claims are not concisely written. Moreover, the claims as a whole lack clarity since, because of the multitude of independent claims it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine the subject of the request for protection, so that the determination of the scope of protection is made difficult for third parties in an unreasonable way.

For this reason claims 1, 3, 19, or 58, 62, 65 do not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.

6. For overcoming this objection it appears practical to file an amended set of claims, in which the subject is defined with as low as possible a number of independent claims in each category, while dependent claims can be added for covering the optional characteristics (Rule 6.4 PCT).